

Application S/N 10/826,953
Amendment Dated: January 11, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: July 28, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 11 2007

CE12724JME

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-20 remain pending in the application, as claims 7 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6, 11-13 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,744,640 to Reis, et al. (Reis). Further, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,998 to Thatcher, et al. (Thatcher). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,583 to Gale, et al (Gale). Finally, claims 10, 15 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reis and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,502,620 to Funck, et al. (Funck).

Independent claims 1, 13 and 17 have been amended by incorporating the elements of claim 10 into these claims. In particular, these claims now include the element that at least one of the first shield and the second shield includes a recessed surface and an un-recessed surface, a surface of the strengthening member is at substantially the same height as the un-recessed surface when the strengthening member is attached to at least one of the first shield and second shield within the recessed surface. The Examiner is contending that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to use the cover (12) with the grooves (13) of Thatcher in Reis and to use the cover panels (34, 36) with the recessed areas (44) of Funck for respectively strengthening the shields and for saving space in the electronic device (see paragraph 6, pages 6-7 of the Office Action of July 28, 2006).

Application S/N 10/826,953
Amendment Dated: January 11, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: July 28, 2006

CE12724JME

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that the disclosed structures in Reis are designed to enhance thermal dissipation (see Abstract; col. 5, lines 18-24; and col. 6, lines 20-24). The heat sink (50), which the Examiner has referred to as a strengthening member (see paragraph 2, page 2 of the Office Action of July 28, 2006), is added to the structure of FIG. 6a to facilitate the dissipation of heat away from the component (11). To combine the recessed areas described in Thatcher and Funck with the shields of Reis would require the heat sink of Reis to cover only the recessed area of the Reis shields to meet the limitation that the a surface of the strengthening member is at substantially the same height as the un-recessed surface. Reis simply teaches away from such a combination because this proposed configuration would drastically reduce the effectiveness of the heat sink, as only a portion of the heat sink would cover the Reis shield(s). That is, the very enhancement that the heat sink in Reis is designed to produce would be vitiated by its limited coverage of a recessed area of this hypothetical shield (Applicants also point out that the recessed areas shown in Thatcher and Funck are minimal when compared to the overall surface areas of the covers to which they belong).

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the above claims are now patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing

Application S/N 10/826,953
Amendment Dated: January 11, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: July 28, 2006

CE12724JME

the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 
Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871